

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Council



Listening Learning Leading

HELD ON THURSDAY 10 OCTOBER 2019 AT 6.00 PM

**THE FOUNTAIN CONFERENCE CENTRE, HOWBERY PARK, CROWMARSH
GIFFORD**

Present:

David Bretherton (Chairman)

Ken Arlett, Anna Badcock, Pieter-Paul Barker, David Bartholomew, Robin Bennett, Sam Casey-Rerhaye, Sue Cooper, Peter Dragonetti, Maggie Filipova-Rivers, Stefan Gawrysiak, Elizabeth Gillespie, Sarah Gray, Kate Gregory, Victoria Haval, Simon Hewerdine, Lorraine Hillier, Kellie Hinton, Alexandrine Kantor, Mocky Khan, George Levy, Lynn Lloyd, Axel Macdonald, Jane Murphy, Caroline Newton, Andrea Powell, Leigh Rawlins, Jo Robb, Sue Roberts, David Rouane, Anne-Marie Simpson, Ian Snowdon, Alan Thompson, David Turner, Ian White and Celia Wilson

Officers: Steven Corrigan, Adrian Duffield, William Jacobs, Holly Jones, Suzanne Malcolm, Adrianna Partridge, Ian Price, Margaret Reed, Andy Roberts and Mark Stone

23 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2019 as a correct record and agree that the chairman sign them as such.

24 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest

Councillor Kantor made a statement in respect of agenda item 7, Local Plan 2034: options to progress, that she is employed at UKAEA Culham – a potential housing site in the Local Plan.

Councillor Turner made a statement in respect of agenda item 7, Local Plan 2034: options to progress, that he is a representative on Culham Local Liaison Committee.

25 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

The chairman provided general housekeeping information.

26 Public participation

The chairman advised that a number of public speakers had registered to address Council on the Local Plan item. He proposed and Council agreed to allow all speakers to have three minutes.

27 Petitions

None.

28 Local Plan 2034: options to progress

Councillor Bretherton, Chairman of the council, invited Mark Stone, Chief Executive, to address Council. The chief executive advised that on Wednesday 9 October the council received a letter from the Rt Hon Robert Jenrick, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, addressed to the leader of the council, which advised that he was considering whether to give a direction to the council in respect of the emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan. He directed the council not to take any step in connection with the adoption of the Local Plan, while he considered the matter. In his letter he offered for his officials to work with council officers to discuss the next steps.

The chief executive advised that he wrote to the Secretary of State on 10 October to seek clarification regarding the direction. The Secretary of State responded prior to the Council meeting and there was nothing in the letter which removed the temporary direction. Until the council hears further from the Secretary of State it was not within the gift of Council to take any step in connection with the adoption of the Local Plan including hearing representations, responding to questions, debating or making a decision on the emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

He recognised that many members of the public were attending the meeting for the Local Plan item and he apologised that the Council was unable to take the matter further at the meeting. He undertook to keep the public informed of any progress via the council's website and social media.

The chairman further advised members of the public that there would be no public speaking or debate on the Local Plan item.

29 Recommendations from Cabinet (Climate Change Advisory Committee)

Council noted that at its meeting on 8 October Cabinet had endorsed the recommendations of the Climate Emergency Advisory Committee, endorsed the direction of travel and supported the motion to be considered at minute 35(3).

30 Extension of terms of office of independent persons to advise on code of conduct issues

Council considered the report of the head of legal and democratic and monitoring officer on extending the terms of office of two independent persons to advise on code of conduct issues.

RESOLVED: to authorise the monitoring officer to extend the terms of office of Chris Smith and George Green, the council's independent persons for code of conduct matters, until 31 October 2020 pending the receipt of further information on potential changes to the standards framework.

31 Climate Emergency Advisory Committee - appointment of substitute

Council considered a proposal to appoint Councillor Gillespie, a non-group councillor, as the named substitute for Councillor Hewerdine on the Climate Emergency Advisory Committee.

RESOLVED: to appoint Councillor Gillespie as the substitute for Councillor Hewerdine on the Climate Emergency Advisory Committee.

32 Constitution Review Task Group

Council considered a proposal to establish a joint Constitution Review Task Group with Vale of White Horse District Council to undertake a review of the constitution and make recommendations to Council.

RESOLVED: to

1. establish a joint Constitution Review Task Group with Vale of White Horse District Council comprising five councillors from each council;
2. allocate a seat to each political group;
3. authorise the head of legal and democratic to make appointments to the task group in accordance with the wishes of the relevant group leader.

33 Report of the leader of the council

Councillor Cooper, Leader of the council, addressed Council. The text of her report is available on the council's [website](#).

34 Questions on notice

1. Question from Councillor Mocky Khan to Councillor Maggie Filipova-Rivers, Cabinet member for community services

There are constant rumours that Didcot Wave is going to be closing, can the Cabinet member confirm what the situation is? Also, there are complaints regards the maintenance and appearance of the building and facilities. What is the work schedule, budget and timings?

ANSWER

There are no plans to close Didcot Wave Leisure Centre. In March 2018, Council took the decision to extend the current management arrangements with GLL to 31 August 2024 in line with the leisure management contract.

There has been significant works to the building in the past 18 months with more than £150,000 investment into essential maintenance and improvement works. This includes improvements to the wetside changing village and a refurbishment of the toilets and wetside shower area and a new air handling unit to improve the air quality in the pool hall. Essential repairs have also been carried out to the roof and gullies to better protect the building from the weather.

In addition, as part of the Council and GLL spend to save initiative, new LED lighting is currently being installed to the wetside changing and poolside area, gym, car park and to the outside of the building which is scheduled for completion at the end of this month. This will help to improve the whole environment making it much brighter, welcoming and safer for customers whilst also helping to reduce the amount of energy the building uses.

A breakdown of the works completed and currently scheduled are as follows:

Programme	Cost	Works	Date Completed
Dryside toilets	£29,000 (Council & GLL)	Full refurbishment of the dry side toilets	September 2016
Wetside Change and toilets	£53,252 (Council)	Includes refurbishment of the toilets, plinths to the lockers, showers and tiling and wetside cubicle/bench upgrades	December 2017
Building fabric works	£76,481 (Council)	Includes surveys, Air Handling Unit and roof works	January – May 2019
Spend to Save	£14,311 (GLL)	GLL LED lighting upgrade to the gym, car park and outside of the building	October 2019
Spend to Save	£8,458 (Council)	Council LED wetside and poolside	October 2019

All councillors have access to privileged information as to council activities which they can access at all times not only during council meetings.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

In response to a supplementary question regarding the perceived lack of awareness amongst residents of these improvements, the Cabinet member undertook to take this issue back to GLL.

2. Question from Councillor Mocky Khan to Councillor Maggie Filipova-Rivers, Cabinet member for community services

Cornerstone in Didcot is a flagship building for culture in South Oxfordshire. I am concerned to hear that the roof is leaking and this has been the case for nearly four years. Can the Cabinet member provide an update and what is happening to resolve this issue?

ANSWER

Cornerstone's roof has been leaking for approximately 18 months, and it has had our full attention during this time. We've had a number of experts out to investigate the issue, including the original contractors. Unfortunately, these investigations were unable to establish the root cause but did suggest a number of theories for the water ingress. The most recent investigation recommended carrying out more invasive investigations to confirm the cause and we're currently seeking the necessary funding to commission a specialist to do this as a matter of urgency. We hope to have the arrangements in place this month, and we will move quickly to get the necessary specialist investigations completed so that we can progress remedial options.

Whilst the roof situation is concerning, none of the expert investigations flagged any safety concerns, and it remains a priority for us.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

In response to a supplementary question regarding the length of time taken to address the issues, the Cabinet member responded that the matter is complicated and required specialist work but the matter did not present a health and safety risk.

3. Question from Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak to Councillor Leigh Rawlins, Cabinet member for planning

In the local plan documents there are options A, B and C. Can I please have a cost estimate for each of these options?

ANSWER

The cost estimate for each of the options are set out in the Cabinet report, paras 131 onwards;

Option A; estimated £5 million for a new plan including examination process, plus the cost of completing the current plan examination process, which we estimate to be in the order of £1 million including inspector and legal costs, **totalling £6 million**

Option B; estimated £5 million for a new plan including examination process, plus the cost of completing and reviewing the emerging plan (under Reg 19), resubmission, examination and adoption, which we estimate would be in the order of £1.6 million including inspector and legal costs, assuming this is completed within sixteen months, **totalling £6.6 million**

Option C; estimated £5 million for a new plan including examination process, **totalling £5 million**

In summary and ranked by cost; Option C is the lowest cost; Option A is the next lowest cost; and Option B is the highest cost.

4. Question from Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak to Councillor Robin Bennett, Cabinet member for Economic Development & Regeneration

Oxfordshire County Council has already spent £1,000,000 developing the HIF/Growth Deal bid. This is Oxfordshire residents' money. If the SODC local plan is withdrawn and the Growth Deal is lost, is South Oxfordshire District Council going to repay this £1,000,000 to OCC?

ANSWER

In advance of any agreement from government on the HIF contract, it is understood that OCC have spent £1,000,000 of their own funds on HIF preparation works. The council has had no definitive confirmation that the HIF/Growth Deal will not proceed should SODC Council decide to withdraw the emerging local plan. The council has received no request to contribute to these costs and the draft HIF contract is a matter between OCC and Homes England/MHCLG. OCC is a separate entity from SODC, which makes separate financial decisions and there is no reason or requirement for SODC to make a payment to them in relation to the costs mentioned.

5. Question from Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak to Councillor David Rouane, Cabinet member for housing and environment

We thank Councillors Rouane and Cooper for visiting Henley to look at our Greys Road public toilets. I think they agreed that they were in a shocking state. SODC derives £700,000 per annum from the Henley car parks which must be recycled back into car parks and car parking. Can we ask that a budget line of £120,000 be put into the next budget to ensure that this toilet is thoroughly refurbished?

Please see below recent photographs showing the shocking state of the toilets.





ANSWER

Officers are drafting project documents to identify the improvements that can be made to the Greys Road car park toilets and the associated costs. Once an outline specification is agreed then cabinet will be asked to transfer the budget from the provisional programme into the approved budget and we can start the procurement process. We are aiming to do this in the next few months and aim to start work in Quarter four 2019/20.

6. Question from Councillor Ken Arlett to Councillor Leigh Rawlins, Cabinet member for planning

Permitted Development Rights (PDR's) government policy, is having a drastic effect on the loss of offices in Henley into flats, I would imagine the same applies across South Oxfordshire. The loss of offices within the town centre also has a knock-on effect to local traders. This government policy may be good for big cities, but it is doing nothing for smaller towns. Other than taking out an Article 4 policy, how does the Cabinet member think this council can address the problem?

ANSWER

Our Authority Monitoring report 2017/18 shows for the district a net gain in employment floorspace from permitted developments in year. During this period there was a significant loss of office floorspace to residential accommodation, whilst floorspace gains were achieved in industry and warehousing. A full analysis of the impact of this prior approval process is needed before considering whether action is required. If action is justified, then the council is limited in what it can do to exempt property owner's rights to permitted development, however an Article 4 Direction (to withdraw those rights) is an approach.

The permitted development rights from office to residential were introduced by Government and local authorities were able to apply for exemptions at this time however the vast majority of these were unsuccessful.

The Government states that there should be a compelling case for the removal of permitted development rights. The use of Article 4 directions to remove permitted development rights should be limited to situations where this is necessary to protect local amenity or the wellbeing of the area. The potential harm that the direction is intended to address should be clearly identified and the Council must show strong justification for the withdrawal of permitted development rights. Therefore, the harm that a direction is intended to address or avoid should be clearly identified, and justification as to its purpose and extent must be given.

It should be noted however that the Secretary of State has the power to make a direction which modifies or cancels an Article 4 direction made by a local planning authority at any time before or after its confirmation, so the need for an evidence-based approach is critical. It should be noted that the Council has previously applied for such an exemption at Henley however this was unsuccessful.

The government is exploring permitted development (PD) rights for new housing to improve standards, the housing minister suggested, as part of the review of the policy announced in the Spring Statement. Housing Secretary Robert Jenrick has stated that the government has "learned from some of the concerns" of the introduction of office-to-residential permitted development rights. The review will focus on the impact on housing quality however the Council could utilise this as an opportunity for change.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

In response to a supplementary question about how to remove the permitted development rights, the Cabinet member responded that the council did not have the power to amend the legislation and that the impact of the current legislation was not clear.

7. Question from Councillor Ken Arlett to Councillor David Rouane, Cabinet member for housing and environment

Since the demise of traffic wardens and SODC's decision to cut funding for PCSO's, there is no one to enforce illegal parking in our towns and villages, this is causing immense problems in town centres and residential roads. SODC has agreed to look into the feasibility of introducing a civil parking enforcement scheme being devolved down from OCC to SODC. As no councillors are involved at present with the feasibility study, I ask that one councillor from at least the four major towns is included in the process?

ANSWER

As you have pointed out the management of Illegal parking on yellow lines on or near junctions, is the responsibility of the police. However, the police direct their resources based on risks which means that people often find that they don't respond to complaints about parking as they would wish. This is why South Oxfordshire District Council decided last year to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other districts to look into transferring this responsibility from the police to the district councils. This is not a simple thing to do, nor is it without cost, and so the county council is leading on a feasibility study for the whole county to determine how it should be done.

Officers are due to bring a report to Cabinet in December with the results of a parking feasibility study and for a decision on whether the council wishes to progress with enforcing illegal parking on-street. The feasibility study focuses on potential operational costs to see if there is a workable business case including joint working with the Vale and Oxfordshire county council. Councillors have received an invitation to a briefing session in the evening of Monday 11 November which will explain what the enforcement parking legislation is about, known as CPE – civil parking enforcement. We cannot embark on this project unless all three councils agree, South, Vale and Cherwell, because the DfT have made it clear that they will not accept a single submission.

If the project goes ahead, in addition the briefing on the 11 November we will engage with stakeholders as the project progresses. To date 28 councillors have confirmed that they will attend the briefing on the 11 November.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

In response to a supplementary question in respect of the future involvement of councillors, the Cabinet member responded that it was premature to consider the involvement of councillors until the receipt of the report setting out proposals.

8. Question from Councillor Ken Arlett to Councillor David Rouane, Cabinet member for housing and environment

On Friday 2 August, myself and Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak met with SODC's Leader Councillor Sue Cooper and Cabinet member Councillor David Rouane in Henley-on-Thames to look at car parking. By mid-day the three central car parks were at capacity. The two out of town car parks at the Rugby Club and the Railway Station are now almost at capacity, and there are numerous reasons for this. In the spring of 2020, there will be 12 new shops opening just off the Kings Road car park, but there is no more car parking to cater for these shops. It has been proposed by SODC in the past that a second floor be built on the Kings Road Car Park. Will SODC work with Henley Town Council, to come up with a scheme for more car parking in the Kings Road car park that will then improve the footfall before we have more shops closing?

ANSWER

The council does not currently have a budget to pursue this proposal which needs further careful consideration. Before we take the decision to embark on a project that encourages more cars to enter Henley town centre an Air Quality Management Area it is important to ensure that alternative options have been exhausted. For example, drivers could be encouraged to use car parks on the edge of town and this may be achieved by working with the county council to improve signage.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

The Cabinet member undertook to provide a written response setting out details of how the money taken in the Henley car parks has been allocated.

9. Question from Councillor Ken Arlett to Councillor David Rouane, Cabinet member for housing and environment

What strides have SODC officers made over the past three months to solve the problem of feeding the parking machines in Henley from the maximum three hours limit?

ANSWER

The council's parking contractors Saba have successfully updated the software used when paying by 'phone so that you are now not able to pay for more than three hours in Henley town centre car parks without leaving for two hours. Further, Saba are trialling an update to the back office software which links up the car parking 'pay and display' machines. This update stops the possibility of being able to buy a ticket from one machine and then get another ticket from any other machine and allowing parking for more than three hours.

However, this slows down the time it takes to issue a ticket so more tests are being carried out to make sure there is an acceptable solution before rolling it out.

35 Motions on notice

- (1) Motion moved by Councillor Alexandrine Kantor and seconded by Councillor Anne-Marie Simpson:

"Council notes that EU nationals are part of our shared communities. They are our husbands, wives, parents, friends and colleagues. They are an integral part of a vibrant and thriving South Oxfordshire.

Since 2016 EU nationals were promised again and again that "there will be no change for EU citizens already lawfully resident in the UK and [...] will be treated no less favourably as they are at present".

After three years of living in limbo, their homes and livelihoods are in danger of being threatened by the further uncertainty brought about by the prospect of an even more chaotic no-deal Brexit.

According to the Home Office's July statistics, only a third of EU nationals have applied for the Settled Status and 42% of them have been granted the inferior Pre-Settled status leading them to reapply for the Settled status later on. There is no possibility of knowing how many EU nationals need to apply, leaving vulnerable and unaware EU nationals left at risk of becoming unlawful residents at the mercy of the Home Office's "Hostile Environment". Lack of clarity regarding differentiating between EU citizens arriving before and after the UK's exit from the EU could lead to discrimination in the labour market and may prevent many from accessing the services that they are entitled to.

Another Windrush-like scandal could be unfolding right before the eyes of this Council and we mustn't be passive observers to it.

Therefore, the Council asks that:

1. Officers report on how the Council can mitigate adverse impacts on the rights of EU nationals (including but not limited to advising on what the Council can do to help landlords and employers to be better informed about immigration status and therefore avoid potential discrimination against EU nationals)

2. The Leader of the Council writes to EU citizens resident in the district giving advice on applying for Settled Status. This notice shall inform EU citizens of any potential consequences of not applying for the EU Settlement scheme.
3. The Leader of the Council writes to the Home Secretary seeking clarification and suggesting improvements for the European Settlement scheme, which include:
 - Providing physical proof of Settled status that can be used to access services
 - Confirming that there will be no changes to the rights of settled EU citizens that they currently have by ratifying the Immigration Bill as primary legislation before the exit day
 - Replacing the current European Settlement scheme with a registration scheme without a deadline where EU citizens are considered lawful by default and can request a proof of immigration status only when they are asked to demonstrate it”.

An amendment moved by Councillor Powell to replace 2 above with the following was accepted by the mover and seconder of the original motion with the agreement of Council:

“The Leader of the Council writes to EU citizens resident in the district giving advice on applying for Settled Status (within the constraints of GDPR). This notice shall direct EU citizens to resources, including the Council’s website, providing up-to-date information on the application process and the potential risks of not applying to the EU Settlement Scheme”.

Councillors expressed the view that non-UK EU nationals are an integral and valuable part of the community and that the council should do everything possible to ensure information and clarity is provided to those affected.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 67, which provides for a recorded vote if three members request one, the Chairman called for a recorded vote on the motion which was declared carried with the voting as follows:

For	Against	Abstain
Councillors	Councillors	Councillors
Ken Arlett		
Anna Badcock		
Pieter-Paul Barker		
David Bartholomew		
Robin Bennett		
David Bretherton		
Sam Casey-Rerhaye		

For	Against	Abstain
Sue Cooper		
Peter Dragonetti		
Maggie Filipova-Rivers		
Stefan Gawrysiak		
Elizabeth Gillespie		
Sarah Gray		
Kate Gregory		
Victoria Haval		
Simon Hewerdine		
Lorraine Hillier		
Kellie Hinton		
Alexandrine Kantor		
Mocky Khan		
George Levy		
Lynn Lloyd		
Axel Macdonald		
Jane Murphy		
Caroline Newton		
Andrea Powell		
Leigh Rawlins		
Jo Robb		
Sue Roberts		
David Rouane		
Anne-Marie Simpson		

For	Against	Abstain
Alan Thompson		
David Turner		
Ian White		
Celia Wilson		
35	0	0

RESOLVED:

That Council notes that EU nationals are part of our shared communities. They are our husbands, wives, parents, friends and colleagues. They are an integral part of a vibrant and thriving South Oxfordshire.

Since 2016 EU nationals were promised again and again that "there will be no change for EU citizens already lawfully resident in the UK and [...] will be treated no less favourably as they are at present".

After three years of living in limbo, their homes and livelihoods are in danger of being threatened by the further uncertainty brought about by the prospect of an even more chaotic no-deal Brexit.

According to the Home Office's July statistics, only a third of EU nationals have applied for the Settled Status and 42% of them have been granted the inferior Pre-Settled status leading them to reapply for the Settled status later on. There is no possibility of knowing how many EU nationals need to apply, leaving vulnerable and unaware EU nationals left at risk of becoming unlawful residents at the mercy of the Home Office's "Hostile Environment". Lack of clarity regarding differentiating between EU citizens arriving before and after the UK's exit from the EU could lead to discrimination in the labour market and may prevent many from accessing the services that they are entitled to.

Another Windrush-like scandal could be unfolding right before the eyes of this Council and we mustn't be passive observers to it.

Therefore, the Council asks that:

1. Officers report on how the Council can mitigate adverse impacts on the rights of EU nationals (including but not limited to advising on what the Council can do to help landlords and employers to be better informed about immigration status and therefore avoid potential discrimination against EU nationals)
2. The Leader of the Council writes to EU citizens resident in the district giving advice on applying for Settled Status (within the constraints of GDPR). This notice shall direct EU citizens to resources, including the Council's website, providing up-to-date information on the application process and the potential risks of not applying to the EU Settlement Scheme.
3. The Leader of the Council writes to the Home Secretary seeking clarification and suggesting improvements for the European Settlement scheme, which include:
 - Providing physical proof of Settled status that can be used to access services

- Confirming that there will be no changes to the rights of settled EU citizens that they currently have by ratifying the Immigration Bill as primary legislation before the exit day
- Replacing the current European Settlement scheme with a registration scheme without a deadline where EU citizens are considered lawful by default and can request a proof of immigration status only when they are asked to demonstrate it.

(2) Motion moved by Councillor David Bartholomew, seconded by Councillor Anna Badcock:

“Reading Borough Council is proposing to build a vast new bridge over the Thames at Caversham to alleviate Reading’s traffic problems. It is included in their Draft Local Plan as a top transport priority. The bridge would take off at the Thames Valley business park near Reading and land near the Playhatch roundabout in Oxfordshire. The only onwards option for traffic would be through the congested streets of Henley or along the narrow B481 country road through Oxfordshire villages.

To date, Reading and other Berkshire councils that are supporting the scheme have focused almost entirely on the costs of building the bridge and the benefits it will bring to Reading. While they recognise that the bridge would have a substantial impact on the Oxfordshire road network, the Berkshire councils blithely state these will be dealt with by unspecified and uncoded ‘mitigation measures’.

This council calls on the Leader to write to the leaders of Reading Borough Council, Wokingham Borough Council and Bracknell Forest Council, together with MPs John Howell, John Redwood, Matt Rodda and Theresa May, stating that:

a) In the context of the Climate Emergency a car-based solution to a car-based problem that would pour thousands of cars and HGVs into Oxfordshire is totally inappropriate and should a new bridge be built it should be restricted to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians;

b) Notwithstanding the above, if a car-based solution is pursued, the proposed bridge and necessary mitigation measures (i.e. improvements to the Oxfordshire road network) are not considered as two separate projects, but as one single project in order that the benefits, disadvantages and costs of the complete scheme can be holistically assessed”.

Councillor Robb moved and Councillor Casey-Rerhaye seconded an amendment to delete part b) of the original motion. Those councillors in support of the amendment expressed the view that the council should not support the building of a bridge for cars and HGVs. The provision of such a bridge was not compatible with the climate emergency. However, other councillors expressed the view that the inclusion of b) was pragmatic and required to ensure that, if a bridge is progressed, measures are put in place to mitigate against the impact on Oxfordshire and particularly the existing road network.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 67, which provides for a recorded vote if three members request one, the Chairman called for a recorded vote on the amendment which was declared lost with the voting as follows:

For	Against	Abstain
Councillors	Councillors	Councillors

For	Against	Abstain
Pieter-Paul Barker	Ken Arlett	Sue Cooper
Robin Bennett	Anna Badcock	Elizabeth Gillespie
Sam Casey-Rerhaye	David Bartholomew	George Levy
Peter Dragonetti	David Bretherton	Andrea Powell
Maggie Filipova-Rivers	Stefan Gawrysiak	
Sarah Gray	Victoria Haval	
Kate Gregory	Lorraine Hillier	
Simon Hewerdine	Mocky Khan	
Kellie Hinton	Lynn Lloyd	
Alexandrine Kantor	Axel Macdonald	
Jo Robb	Jane Murphy	
Sue Roberts	Caroline Newton	
David Rouane	Leigh Rawlins	
Anne-Marie Simpson	Alan Thompson	
	David Turner	
	Ian White	
	Celia Wilson	
14	17	4

Councillor Rawlins moved and Councillor Hewerdine seconded an amendment to include the following wording at the end of the original motion:

“Council recognises the challenges of Reading’s traffic congestion and pressure on cross-Thames capacity. However, before any bridge proposal is advanced, Council calls on Cabinet and officers to engage with Reading Borough Council to develop mutually acceptable measures to REDUCE cross-Thames car and commercial vehicle volumes through a variety of joined-up mitigation measures. These should include exploration of scope for Park-and-Ride facilities and improved rapid bus services to the station and key business parks in the town”.

Those councillors in support of the amendment expressed the view that the council had a duty to co-operate with Reading Borough Council to develop mutually acceptable measures to reduce cross-Thames car and commercial vehicle volumes through a variety of joined up mitigation measures including park and ride, improved rapid bus services to the railway station and key business parks in the town. However, a number of councillors expressed the view that the amendment 'muddied the waters' and that the council should concentrate on opposing the construction of a bridge.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 67, which provides for a recorded vote if three members request one, the Chairman called for a recorded vote on the amendment which was declared lost with the voting as follows:

For	Against	Abstain
Councillors	Councillors	Councillors
Pieter-Paul Barker	Ken Arlett	Robin Bennett
Sue Cooper	Anna Badcock	Sam Casey-Rerhaye
Elizabeth Gillespie	David Bartholomew	Peter Dragonetti
Sarah Gray	David Bretherton	Maggie Filipova-Rivers
Simon Hewerdine	Stefan Gawrysiak	Victoria Haval
Leigh Rawlins	Kate Gregory	Alexandrine Kantor
	Lorraine Hillier	Sue Roberts
	Kellie Hinton	
	Mocky Khan	
	George Levy	
	Lynn Lloyd	
	Axel Macdonald	
	Jane Murphy	
	Caroline Newton	
	Andrea Powell	
	Jo Robb	
	David Rouane	
	Anne-Marie Simpson	

For	Against	Abstain
	Alan Thompson	
	David Turner	
	Ian White	
	Celia Wilson	
6	22	7

Those councillors who spoke in support of the motion expressed the view that the council should oppose the building of a bridge for cars and HGVs, that if a bridge is progressed it should be restricted to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians and that if a car based bridge is constructed measures should be put in place to protect the AONB in Oxfordshire, the inadequate road network and rural villages.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

RESOLVED:

That Reading Borough Council is proposing to build a vast new bridge over the Thames at Caversham to alleviate Reading's traffic problems. It is included in their Draft Local Plan as a top transport priority. The bridge would take off at the Thames Valley business park near Reading and land near the Playhatch roundabout in Oxfordshire. The only onwards option for traffic would be through the congested streets of Henley or along the narrow B481 country road through Oxfordshire villages.

To date, Reading and other Berkshire councils that are supporting the scheme have focused almost entirely on the costs of building the bridge and the benefits it will bring to Reading. While they recognise that the bridge would have a substantial impact on the Oxfordshire road network, the Berkshire councils blithely state these will be dealt with by unspecified and uncoded 'mitigation measures'.

This council calls on the Leader to write to the leaders of Reading Borough Council, Wokingham Borough Council and Bracknell Forest Council, together with MPs John Howell, John Redwood, Matt Rodda and Theresa May, stating that:

a) In the context of the Climate Emergency a car-based solution to a car-based problem that would pour thousands of cars and HGVs into Oxfordshire is totally inappropriate and should a new bridge be built it should be restricted to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians;

b) Notwithstanding the above, if a car-based solution is pursued, the proposed bridge and necessary mitigation measures (i.e. improvements to the Oxfordshire road network) are not considered as two separate projects, but as one single project in order that the benefits, disadvantages and costs of the complete scheme can be holistically assessed.

(3) Motion moved by Councillor Sue Roberts, seconded by Councillor Simon Hewerdine:

“On 11 April 2019, South Oxfordshire District Council declared a Climate Emergency, noting that the 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report states that we had just 12 years to act. Council resolved that it needs to commit to aggressive reduction targets and carbon neutrality as quickly as possible.

Since then, there has been a continual onslaught of extreme weather events that further highlight the climate emergency. In July, the European heat wave killed 868 in France, and set a new temperature high for the UK of 38.5°C. There were unprecedented wildfires in the Arctic. In September, Hurricane Dorian killed 50 in the Bahamas and left 70,000 homeless. More generally, we have severe ice melting at the poles, and sea level rise at the upper end of forecasts.

In September, Professor Sir David King, former Chief Scientist for the UK, said the world had changed faster than predicted by the IPCC. Whereas mean global temperature rises have matched predictions, individual extreme weather events have accelerated in intensity and frequency. In this grave situation, he says, the UK should aim to cut greenhouse gas emissions to almost zero, by 2040 rather than 2050.

South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) has set up a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee (CEAC). At its first official meeting on the 19th September it recommended the very challenging targets proposed here. It should be noted that other councils have set targets for their districts and cities to reach net zero-carbon by 2030, some even earlier. The Labour Party at its recent conference has also set a 2030 net zero-carbon target for the country.

Officers prepared options for CEAC to consider, including a focus only on Council operations; extending this to taking action on net zero-carbon over district-actives where Council has responsibilities, whilst responding reactively wherever possible to new initiatives for the district; and finally, for full net zero-carbon for the whole district. The cross-party committee unanimously agreed to a fully net zero-carbon district by 2030, with Council, in its own operations, to be net zero-carbon by 2025.

These targets are premised on the fact that SODC should be in a new building by 2025, and that it can influence outsourced contractors to provide us with a net zero-carbon supply chain. The aim for a net-zero carbon total district is to ensure that Council has a true target in the sense that it knows what it is that it is aiming to get to zero-carbon, and to ensure that its actions are more than purely reactive; rather, Council shall set up an ambitious new programme working with other actors to achieve its target.

Council resolves to:

Agree the unanimous recommendations of its cross-party Climate Emergency Advisory Committee to:

- Aim to reach net-zero carbon emissions across all of the operations of South Oxfordshire District Council by the target year of 2025
- Aim to reach net-zero carbon emissions for the whole District of South Oxfordshire by 2030”

The majority of councilors supported the motion which would allow the council to have targets to aim for and to set an example to the wider community. The view was expressed that Council should receive annual updates on progress against the targets.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

RESOLVED:

That On 11 April 2019, South Oxfordshire District Council declared a Climate Emergency, noting that the 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report states that we had just 12 years to act. Council resolved that it needs to commit to aggressive reduction targets and carbon neutrality as quickly as possible.

Since then, there has been a continual onslaught of extreme weather events that further highlight the climate emergency. In July, the European heat wave killed 868 in France, and set a new temperature high for the UK of 38.5°C. There were unprecedented wildfires in the Arctic. In September, Hurricane Dorian killed 50 in the Bahamas and left 70,000 homeless. More generally, we have severe ice melting at the poles, and sea level rise at the upper end of forecasts.

In September, Professor Sir David King, former Chief Scientist for the UK, said the world had changed faster than predicted by the IPCC. Whereas mean global temperature rises have matched predictions, individual extreme weather events have accelerated in intensity and frequency. In this grave situation, he says, the UK should aim to cut greenhouse gas emissions to almost zero, by 2040 rather than 2050.

South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) has set up a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee (CEAC). At its first official meeting on the 19th September it recommended the very challenging targets proposed here. It should be noted that other councils have set targets for their districts and cities to reach net zero-carbon by 2030, some even earlier. The Labour Party at its recent conference has also set a 2030 net zero-carbon target for the country.

Officers prepared options for CEAC to consider, including a focus only on Council operations; extending this to taking action on net zero-carbon over district-actives where Council has responsibilities, whilst responding reactively wherever possible to new initiatives for the district; and finally, for full net zero-carbon for the whole district. The cross-party committee unanimously agreed to a fully net zero-carbon district by 2030, with Council, in its own operations, to be net zero-carbon by 2025.

These targets are premised on the fact that SODC should be in a new building by 2025, and that it can influence outsourced contractors to provide us with a net zero-carbon supply chain. The aim for a net-zero carbon total district is to ensure that Council has a true target in the sense that it knows what it is that it is aiming to get to zero-carbon, and to ensure that its actions are more than purely reactive; rather, Council shall set up an ambitious new programme working with other actors to achieve its target to:

Agree the unanimous recommendations of its cross-party Climate Emergency Advisory Committee to:

- Aim to reach net-zero carbon emissions across all of the operations of South Oxfordshire District Council by the target year of 2025

- Aim to reach net-zero carbon emissions for the whole District of South Oxfordshire by 2030.

36 Exclusion of the public

RESOLVED: to exclude members of the press and public from the meeting for the following item of business under Part 1 of Schedule 12A Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 on the grounds that:

- i. it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and
- ii. the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

37 New office accommodation - design, sustainability and building specification

Council considered Cabinet's recommendations, made at its meeting on 8 October 2019, on the progress of the new council office building and car park programme at the council's Crowmarsh Gifford site.

Council resolved to:

1. note the progress of the new council office building and car park programme at the council's Crowmarsh Gifford site; and
2. allocate additional budget provision to the capital scheme in the approved programme.

The meeting closed at 9.40pm

Chairman

Date